DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 350 SE 027 803

AUTHOR Hoagland, Sarah Lucia
TITLE Naming, Describing, Explaining: Deception and Science.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (Houston, Texas, January 6, 1979); Contains occasional light and broken type

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; Conceptual Schemes; *Feminism; *Science Education; *Scientific Methodology; Sex (Characteristics); Sex Differences; *Sex Discrimination; Womens Education; Womens Studies

ABSTRACT

Presented is a discussion on feminism and the scientific method. Some deceptive features of the scientific method are presented to show how feminists charge scientists with deception and anti-empiricism. Selected conceptual patterns and conceptual boundaries in science are discussed with respect to femininity. (HM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179350

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: SE FL
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sarah Hoagland
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NAMING, DESCRIBING, EXPLAINING: DECEPTION AND SCIENCE*

Sarah Lucia Hoagland
Department of Philosophy
Northeastern Illinois University
Chicago, Illinois 60625

SE 027 803

* Paper delivered at the panel, "Feminism and the Philosophy of Science" at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, January 6, 1979, Houston, Texas.

CN001785

The technology of silence
The rituals, etiquette

The blurring of terms
silence not absence

of words or music or even
raw sounds

Silence can be a plan
rigorously executed

the blueprint to a life

It is a presence
it has a history a form

Do not confuse it with any kind of absence

Adrienne Rich, "Cartographies of Silence"

And woman, it is observed, like the Negro, is flat-footed, with a prominent inclination of the pelvis making her appear less erect, and her gait less steady.

That as regards his intellectual faculties, the Negro partakes of the nature of the child or the female or the senile white.

And both the emancipated woman and the Negro freedman are said to exhibit symptoms of insanity or nervousness.

Susan Griffin, WOMEN AND NATURE

Our subterranean grapevine, which men, like fools, call gossip,
has always been efficient.
Our sabotage has ranged from witches' research
into herbal poisons to secretaries' spilling coffee on the files
to housewives' accidentally breaking china
to mothers' teaching their children to love them
a little bit better than their fathers. And more.
Our rebellions, like the Turkish harem revolts,
have been (as was Nat Turner's) frequent, brave
isolated one from the other, bloody--and buried,
both in reality and in the history books.

Robin Morgan, "Letter to a Sister Underground"

Feminists charge scientists with deception and anti-empiricism, claiming science operates from an androcentric and Eurocentric consciousness dominated by a weltanschauung of conquest and control: man over women and nature. Patriarchal deceiving stems from white and male supremist visions of individual scientists, a fact other scientists have documented. But deceiving also emerges from the scientific method, yielding a governing patriarchal ontology and epistemology. My efforts, my participation, my interactions concern conceptual patterns and conceptual boundaries in science.

NAMING

Behind the admitted scientific activity of describing lies a less acccessible process of labeling through which scientists appropriate the power of naming. Scientists rarely, if ever, bring this activity to light in a way that either encourages self-criticism or permits public scrutiny. Instead, many members of the scientific community, save perhaps most linguists, adhere to a naive reference theory of language: words, labels, mean the objects to which they "refer" and remain neutral with respect to those objects. Scientists approaching language atomistically encourage deception in at least three ways: First, they focus on objects while obscuring word usage and so bury the context out of which the words arise. Second, they bury acknowledgment of and thus general awareness of control the powerful exercise over language use.[1] Finally, they bury the defining nature of labeling. If I describe something, I state how it appears to me, leaving my characterization open to investigation by other perceivers. Alternatively, when I define something, I determine its social appearance.

Scientists and other male elite named wimmin, "feminine," the most pervasive label infecting our lives. I argue elsewhere that "femininity" is not an empirical concept, a concept which takes counterexamples.[2] Scientists discredit actual counterexamples by naming us "abnormalities," using "femininity" as a standard of womynhood, femaleness. Measures or standards determine fact, no amount of research into wimmin's "true nature," no appeal to fact, will either confirm or challenge the concept, the label, femininity. For example, officials regularly perform scientifically sanctioned hormone tests on strong wimmin such as olympic swimmers who come to public attention.

Characteristics which ordinarily pass under the label, feminine, include: passive, emotional, irrational or even, non-rational, unassuming, cooperative (With whom?), non-threatening (To whom?), behind the scenes (Whose scenes?), weak, gullible (When?) childlike, infantile. Kate Millett pointed out ten years ago that "femininity" characterizes traits those in power cherish in subordinates.[3] Viola Klein documented the fanciful and contradictory nature of the scientific collection of feminine characteristics.[4] And Caroline Whitbeck isolated three prevailing theories composing the foundation of those characterisitcs all of which define wimmin in relation to men: womyn as partial man, womyn as opposite man, and womyn as helpmate to man.[5] "Femininity" maintains existing lines of power by categorizing wimmin in relation to men and defining as normal the womyn who remains totally accessible to male authority. "Cunning," "manipulative," and "deceitful" comprise the labels men reserve for wimmin who try to exercise some form of power over men without challenging the feminine label. Ten years ago, also, Naomi Weisstein noted that the feminine characteristics add up to typical minority group characteristics.[6] Significantly, black South Africans have been feminine by white British anthropologists, as were men accused of witchcraft in Salem by the church,[7] as were Jews by Nazi researchers.[8]

Femininity is universally synomymous with passivity.[9] Any womyn raised

in this society faces silencing and conceptual restriction. Any womyn attempting to realize her creativity is by definition deviant. Any womyn acting to fulfill her potential must, at the very least, see herself as unique, not a normal womyn, not one of them. Many of us have done just that. Any womyn not broken, who acts to see herself in other wimmin, must question the entire framework within which she came to cognition. Any womyn attempting this in isolation may go crazy, she may lose the confidence of her perceptions.

By the very act of our naming, scientists and other male elite determined the boundaries of female behavior; only certain descriptions count, and those in turn determine the boundaries of possible explanation in science. The concept of femininity defines wimmin as passive and in relation to men so pervasively that officials bury or otherwise render invisible wimmin who do not relate to men as well as wimmin who resist male domination.[10] Acts of female resistance as well as acts of female bonding, Lesbian bonding, do not exist within the ontology of patriarchal science. Even many wimmin believe that British and American female resistance only began with and was limited to suffragists and their vocal foresisters.

DESCRIPTION

Scientists describe, and we tend to beleive their reports are mere mirrors or photographs, reproductions in their minds of actual fact. The scientific method suggests that a good scientist is an accurate observer, one who looks through a window, observing phenomena. Of course, some things present problems for observation because they are too small or too big or too many which is theoretically why we employ scientists in the first place, people trained in perception by other scientists, people who have instruments for perception. These official perceivers may contradict perceptions of those not so trained, thereby suggesting that what was produced in the lay perceiver's mind did not correspond with fact. And scientists construct theories to explain what the lay perceiver should perceive, what should be in the

lay perceiver's mind.

At this level of endeavor, scientists use the charge of observer bias to criticize each other, to show that particular scientists let their prejudices interfere with their observations.[11] The criticism amounts to a charge of sloppiness. It does not challenge the scientific method per se, in fact it perpetuates the model of scientist as ovserver: It reminds scientists that a "good" scientist suspends all assumptions, all conditioning, all evaluation, all judgment while impartially and nonintrusively observing events on the other side of an imaginary window.

The model of scientist as ovserver is atomistic. Even physics, the science social scientists tend to emmulate as pure, has had to reject it, substituting instead a model of scientist as participator, interactor:

> "Participator" is the incontrovertible new concept given by quantum mechanics; it strikes down the term "observer" of classical theory, the man who stands safely behind the thick glass walls and watches what goes on without taking part. It can't be done, quantum mechanics says. Even with the lowly electron one must participate before one can give any meaning whatsoever to its position or its momentum. Is this firmly established result the tiny tip of a giant iceberg? Does the universe also derive its meaning from "participation"?[12]

To some extent, the idea of scientist as participator has been introduced to the social sciences. Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson conducted experiments indicating that teacher expectation, resulting from claims Rosenthal and Jacobson made about the intelligence of randomly selected school children, became self-fulfilling prophesy, affecting the performance of those children. By analogy, the research suggests that when scientists interact with subjects, the scientists' expectations will affect the outcome of an experiment.

This research indicates major deceptive features of the scientific method in the form of self-fulfilling prophesy. In the first place, prediction often become self-fulfilling prophesy in and of itself. Secondly, labeling, naming, determines how the experimentor/teacher, as well as everyone else, perceives the

the subjects: Regardless of whether subjects actually perform according to expectation/prediction, others will judge the behavior of members of the labeled group in conformity with the labels.

In addition, a third level of self-fulfilling prophesy operates, a level not addressed by the Rosenthal-Jacobson research: The subject who successfully resists perceiving herself in the terms of the experimentor, a womyn for example who retains her own conceptual framework independently of femininity, must still react to, and to that extent, internalize, scientists' assumption. In resisting the label, she must still acknowledge it. If I argue that I am not feminine, or that wimmin in general are not feminine, or that blacks are not genetically inferior, I nevertheless lend legitemacy to these assumptions and admit that although false, they still make sense.

And there is a fourth level of self-fulfilling prophesy: The Rosenthal-Jacobson research also does not warn us that scientific naming limits the range of possible description of subjects' behavior. Within a patriarchal framework, I can not describe the behavior of one labeled feminine in terms suggesting resistance, subversion.

Finally, the Rosenthal-Jacobson experiments do not go far enough in identifying general features of the social context out of which the experimentor expectations arise--we do not find an investigation of just whose expectations are fulfilled in experiments. Nor do we find most scientists including as part of their data the fact that this is a sexist, racist, classist, ageist and heterosexist society, a fact which bears on subjects' responses. When denying its political context, scientists perceive rational behavior as deviant. Patriarchal epistemology permits certain theories of supremacy, in particular, white and male, to pass as "objective" description. In that respect, science deceptively reinforces the status quo under the guise of pure description, contributing to patriarchal ontology.

In spite of their shortcomings, the Rosenthal-Jacobson findings have not led to substantive change in social science methodology: As in the case of observer bias, scientists are for the most part merely warned not to be sloppy and let their expectations affect their work. For example, scientists proposed the doubled-blind method as a remedy in certain sorts of experiments. The Rosenthal-Jacobson findings have had little substantive methodological impact because the goals of objectivity and impartiality loom large as the essence of patriarchal scientific research.

To be rigorously objective, one must sterilize the experiment or study, removing all vestiges of a point of view. The goal of an experiment sterilized of points of view presents an endeavor similar to an attempt to perceive the true color of something under no conditions of perception. Objectivity is nothing but a collection of perceptions which agree. Even if scientists recognize that the model of scientist as observer is impossible, so long as the reigning concept of objectivity prevails, the model will remain desirable, and scientists will be like existentialists who upon heralding the death of god, spent the rest of their work in mourning.

Finally, the most seriously deceptive and non-empirical aspect of science lies in the goal of impartiality. Impartiality allows the scientist to ignore or discredit the subject's perspective, especially when that clashes with the scientist's own perspective. Impartiality means researchers should see themselves as qualitatively different form their subjects. Sociologist Pauline Bart has had her research on rape criticized by males in her profession on the grounds that as a womyn, she could not remain impartial.[13] Aside from the fact that such comments reflect typical male presumption that while males too are involved in rape, nevertheless they would not infect their own research, it also suggests that there is something methodologically problematic with any empathy Dr. Bart might bring to her research in attempting to understand the actions of rape victims.

Under the guidelines of rigor in description, science cannonizes the

perspective of the scientist while in the name of impartiality, excluding, burying, the perspective of the subject. Behind the goal of impartiality in scientific description lies an important function of scientific methodology: Scientists deny subjects a part in our own naming.

EXPLANATION

In spite of appropriating the power of naming from their subjects, scientists managed to come up with conflicting descriptions of femininity during the latter half of the 19th century as noted above. The conflict arose from the different ways scientists characterized wimmin in relation to men: Womyn as partial man, womyn as opposite man or womyn as helpmate to man. As Viola Klein notes, even studies involving "measurable facts" varied widely.[14] Nevertheless, scientists were clear on one thing. They isolated and promoted the heterosexual side of nature while burying the lesbian side, eventually using evolutionary theory to justify their selectivity. In time, evolutionary theory also served as a check on the varying male-identified descriptions of wimmin. As Viola Klein remarked: "On this basis, any trait which is in harmony with the general trend of evolution will be artificial and transient."[15] Evolutionary theory would serve to distinguish the "natural" from the "abnormal."

Evolutionary theory is a paradigm of explanation for the social sciences. The social sciences concern themselves with goal directed, purposive behavior, a feature distinguishing them from the physical sciences. One commences with subjects who have motives, act on intentions, make plans, set goals, issue directives, arrange outcomes, exhibit responsibility, in short, subjects who attempt at varying levels to direct their own behavior. However, as a result of scientific methodology, including existing concepts of objectivity and impartiality, focus rapidly shifts from the purpose of an individual's behavior--how she would explain her action, to the purpose of a system--how her behavior "fits" within a grand design regardless of her own intentions.[16]

The purpose of a system, the design of a system, sits at the heart of what philosopher of science Richard Rudner calls functionalism.[17] And empathy, he says, is for poets. The task of science is prediction:

> A related and only slightly less egregious confusion about the character and functions of science consists...in the belief that the statements of science should convey to us the same, or something like the same, sensations, reactions, responses--in a word, experiences--as would be conveyed by an actual confrontation with what those statements describe. It might, of course, be argued that this is a function of art--of poetry or painting--but it seems scarcely tenable that this should be an aim of the formation of scientific statements; for the very thrall in which experiences so conveyed may hold us might be quite incompatible with, and is surely irrelevant to, our predictive, explanatory, or other systematizing uses of such statements.[18]

Scientists do not consider the thrall of their own weltanschauung incompatible with prediction. But then scientists do the predicting. Sympathy, verstehen, could cloud the work of science, Rudner says, get in the way of prediction. This approach indicates one deceptive feature of functionalism, for prediction is compatible with mutually exclusive descriptions of behavior. As I point out in the next section, the very same behavior can be perceived as a clumsy act or as an act of sabotage, and "predictions" can be made on the basis of either perspective.

The second major deception of functionalism involves the deleted agent. Even relativist Peter Winch, who stresses the need to understand a subject's explanations for her behavior within the context of the rules of her society, fails to incorporate acknowledgment that someone determines the rules, that even if perception is a matter of consensus, there is also coercion, for females are trapped.[19] Who determines what a subject ought to do, what is normal, what is abnormal? Whose purpose, whose design, whose scheme of things? Functional for whom?

Some feminists have begun to step back from science and rather than attack a particularly sexist or racist study on the grounds that it is sloppy, we observe patterns. We see, for example, that the theory of evolution is rhetoric justifying male domination. We notice that just as the feminist demand for rights

again achieves public acknowledgment, ethical attention is diverted to biology, this time to sc..obiology, where the dogma of male supremacy appears on safe ground, where male domination, including rape and infanticide, is heralded as an ethical necessity for the preservation of the species.[20]

Within patriarchal science, scientists condemn female competency as threatening to males and subversive to the family, hence as socially undesirable. Thus Daniel P. Moynihan developed the theory of the black matriarch who castrates black men. Within patriarchal science, female bonding is erased. Thus sociobiology employs the term, "maiden aunt" in a homosexual context, burying the idea of a female rejecting a male and suggesting instead a female's "inability" to attract one.[21] And female resistance, female attempts at wrenching free of male accessibility, of male definition, male domination, become anti-social, neurotic or psychotic, with neurosurgery ever ready to erase untenable connections.

One searches in vain for scientific portraits of female independence, female resistance, female bonding. Patriarchal science, appropriating the power of naming, renders those phenomena, this phenomenon, invisible.

SABOTAGE

In THE YELLOW WALLPAPER, Charlotte Perkins Gilman portrayed conditions faced by upper class Victorian wimmin in the 1880's.[22] These conditions included a prescription of total female passivity by mind gynecologists such as S. Weir Mitchell, prescriptions arising as a result of male scientists' sudden interest in wimmin as the first wave of feminism attracted their attention, prescriptions enforced by those in power. The heroine is taken by her husband to a summer home for rest. He locks her in a nursery with bars on the windows, a bed bolted to the floor, and hideous wallpaper, shredded in spots. He rebuts her despair with the rhetoric of protection, refusing to indulge her "whims" when she protests the room's atrocity. He also stifles all other attempts at creativity, flying into a rage when he

discovers her while she writes in her diary. In the end, she manages to crawl behind the wallpaper and escape into "madness." Charlotte Perkins Gilman shows us a womyn with every avenue of creativity patronizingly and paternalistically cut off for "her own good," to "protect" her, and we watch her slowly construct her resistance. Not surprisingly, male scientists and doctors of the day saw nothing more in the story than a testament to female insanity. Feminsts recognize resistance to male domination.[23]

Significantly, one and the same word governs insanity and anger. As Phyllis Chesler has documented, mind gynecologists call wimmin mad whose behavior they can no longer understand as functioning in relation to men.[24] On the other hand, the OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY defines anger madness as ungovernable rage or fury. One must ask, "ungovernable" by whom? Madness in anger and madness in "insanity" indicate that men have lost control. When wimmin are labeled mad, we have become useless to them.

Recently, ex-mental patients organized and began analyses of "mental illness" from the inside. Judi Chamberlain offers the following:

> Freaking out is a way of rejecting the limited choices offered by society. Rather than choose among a series of undesirable alternatives, one makes a non-choice--the unfocussed rebellion of refusal....The patients' "refusal" to take the proper role is defined as an illness. For the public, this serves the function of obscuring whatever meaningful elements the patient's protest contained, by including in the class of "symptoms" both the refusal and the usually bizarre ways in which the patient has been forced to express it.[25]

Choices made by those labeled mad are rational alternatives to untenable circumstances. This, of course, is not a new idea. But when one couples that with the situation wimmin face in one form or another, of being defined in relation to men, a trap from which there is no "legitemate" escape, descending into "madness" becomes a form of sabotage, of taking oneself out of the confining power of those in control, of affirming one's will as independant and separate, of resistance.

Conceptual coercion of the patriarchal social construction of reality

is pervasive. One searches in vain for statements of female resistance to male dominance from the namers, the authorities, the professionals. Erasure, burial, is complete. Even existentialists, those great defenders of "human" freedom and choice, label resistance to one's oppressive situation "bad faith." [26] Only feminists perceive resistance, and not by impartial scientific studies, but rather by very personal, intimate, investigations. In a 1916 play, "Trifles," Susan Glaspell unfolds the tale of a womyn who murdered her husband, strangled him while he slept.[27] The sheriff, the county attorney, and their wives have access to the evidence. But only the wimmin suspect, uncover, and then bury in conspiracy proof of the motive, proof found among "trifles." The authorities remain incapable of recognizing a situation calling for resistance.

When a theory of supremacy founds a conceptual framework, those in power use a feminine model to characterize the oppressed as passively accepting their lot, while burying a few "minor" "inexplicable" events as extraordinary. History books depict Southern black slaves (though not white indentured servants) as lazy, docile, and clumsy on the ground, for example, that they frequently broke tools. A rational womyn under slavery, comprehending her situation is less than human, that she functions as an extension of the will of her master, will not run to pick up tools. She acts instead to differentiate herself from the will of her master, she breaks tools, she carries on subversive activities, sabotage. Her master, in turn, perceiving her as subhuman, sub-rational, sees her as clumsy, childlike, foolish, perhaps, but not as saboteur. He is incapable of such perception. In fact, all the actions of slaves out of which the masters constructed slave stereotypes were sabotage. The stereotypes that arose provide testimony to slave resistance.

Simarly, acts which the namers use to support the stereotype of white middle class wimmin, the paradigm of all womynhood, indicate resistance. Alix Kates Shulamn in MEMOIRS OF AN EX-PROM QUEEN, portrays a "fluffyheaded" housewife who

regularly burns the dinner when her husband brings his boss home.[28] And she periodically packs raw eggs in his lunchbox.

Such acts may or may not be openly called sabotage by the saboteurs. But wimmin engage in them to affirm existence in a society which denies recognition independently of a man. These are rational alternatives to untenable situations, to traps.

Donna Deitch's fabulous documentary, "Woman to Woman" offers a classic example of sabotage.[29] Four wimmin, two housewives, a daughter and the interviewer, sit around a kitchen table. One housewife protests that she is not a housewife, that she is not married to the house. The interviewer asks her to say what she does all day. The womyn relates that she starts by getting up, feeding her husband, feeding her children, driving them to the shcool bus, driving her husband to work, returning to do the dishes, make the beds, going out to do the shopping, returning to do a wash. She continues relating her activities for a normal Monday and half of a Tuesday before she stops, shocked, and says: "Wait a minute, I am married to the house." She complains of difficulty in getting her husband to give her money for the household and of frustration because he nevertheless holds her responsible for running the house. Suddenly she gets a gleam in her eye, lowers her voice and leans forward, saying: "Have you ever bought something you didn't need?" Excitement brews and they all lean closer as she states: "You have to know you're alive, you have to make sure you exist." She has separated herself from her husband's perceptions of her; she is not simply an extension of his purposes, of his will.

Female resistance, whether it results in actual madness or not, remains undetected qua resistance within the framework of patriarchal science because of deception at all three levels of scientific endeavor. The deception emmanates not just from a few off-balance thoughts, a few prejudices, but from mainstream science, from scientific methodology. The goals of predictability, conquest, and control go hand in hand with descriptions of oppressed people in the feminine model, including

a portrait of naive contentment with being controlled. Our naming sets limits to our conceptual reality. Anything outside it does not exist. Such is the ontology of patriarchal science.

FOOTNOTES

1. Thus it has taken a feminist perspective to expose an initial step in the takeover of midwifery by male professionalization through the official derogation of "wicca," "wisewomyn," "witch." (Deidre English and Barbara Ehrenreich, WITCHES, MIDWIVES AND NURSES, New York: Feminist Press, 1973).

2. Sarah L. Hoagland, "On the Status of the Concepts of Masculinity and Femininity," TRANSACTIONS OF THE NEBRASKA ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, Vol. 4, August, 1977.

3. Kate Millett, SEXUAL POLITICS (New York: Avon, 1971), p. 47.

4. Viola Klein, THE FEMININE CHARACTER (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1971), p. 41.

5. Caroline Whitbeck, "Theories of Sex Difference," WOMEN AND PHILOSOPHY, Carol C. Gould and Marx W. Wartofsky, eds. (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1976), pp. 54-81.

6. Naomi Weisstein, "Psychology Constructs the Female, or: The Fantasy Life of the Male Psychologist" (Boston, Mass., New England Free Press, 1968).

7. Research of Betty Carptenter, personal communication, Spring, 1978, Lincoln, NE.

8. Often, as men of oppressed groups come to power, they lay claim to masculinity while insisting on seeing "their" wimmin as feminine.

9. Conceptually, an "active" female is one which bears many offspring.

10. The invisibility carries over into descriptions of females in other animal species. See, e.g., Sarah L. Hoagland, "Androcentric Rhetoric in Sociobiology," unpublished manuscript.

11. Observer bias occurs in many parts of a study: the topics scientists choose to investigate, the subjects they choose to observe, the way they choose to design the experiment, the features they choose for control groups, the data they choose to record, and the way they read, record, interpret, and finally explain their data.

12. Charles W. Misner, et. al., GRAVITATION (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Co., 1973), p. 1217.

13. Personal communication, Spring, 1978, Chicago, Illinois.

14. Viola Klein, op. cit., p. 42.

15. Ibid., p. 43.

16. A pseudo-battle wages between universalists and relativists. Both what Richard Rudner calls "functionalism" (see note 17), and Ernest Gellner's contextualism (Ernest Gellner, "Concepts and Society," SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY AND PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS, Dorothy Emmet and Alasdair Macintyre, eds. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1970), p. 117.), appeal to design, teleology, burying the subject's motives when they conflict with either the universal design or the offical view of the context studied. Neither acknowledge political power relations among subjects or between the scientist and subject.

17. Richard Rudner, PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), pp. 69.

18. Ibid., p. 69.

19. Sarah L. Hoagland, "Coercive Consensus," SINISTER WISDOM, 6, pp. 86-88.

20. Sarah L. Hoagland, "Androcentric Rhetoric in Sociobiology," unpublished manuscript.

21. E. O. Wilson, SOCIOBIOLOGY: THE NEW SYNTHESIS (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975), pp. 311, 343.

22. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, THE YELLOW WALLPAPER (New York: The Feminist Press, 1973).

23. Elaine R. Hedges, "Afterword," Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Ibid.

24. Phyllis Chesler, WOMEN AND MADNESS (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1972).

25. Judi Chamberlin, "Women's Oppression and Psychiatric Oppression," MADNESS NETWORK NEWS, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 9. (Reprinted in WOMEN LOOK AT PSYCHIATRY, Press Gang Publishers, Vancouver, B.C.).

26. Jean-Paul Sartre, ANTI-SEMITE AND JEW (New York: Schocken Books, 1974).

27. Susan Glaspell, "Trifles," ENGLISH ONE-ACT PLAYS, Ed. Donald Fitzjohn (N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1962), also appeared as a short story, "A Jury of Her Peers," AMERICAN WOMEN: AMERICAN VOICES, Lee Edwards & Arlyn Diamond, eds. (New York: Avon).

28. Alix Kates Shulman, MEMOIRS OF AN EX-PROM QUEEN (New York: Bantam, 1973).

29. Copies of the film can be obtained from Donna Deitch, 3644 Carnation Ave., Los Angeles, California 90026.